

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Criminal Case No. 91-80936-12  
Honorable Patrick J. Duggan

KARL WINGO,

Defendant.

---

**OPINION AND ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR  
CLARIFICATION OF COURT’S PREVIOUSLY ISSUED ORDERS**

Presently before this Court is Defendant Karl Wingo’s “Motion for Clarification of Court’s Previously Issued Orders,” filed January 17, 2014. In his motion, Wingo asks the Court to clarify whether there is or is not a drug quantity on which his sentence was based. He indicates that he seeks an answer to determine whether he is eligible for a reduction of his sentence pursuant to the amendments to the United States Sentencing Guidelines for crack cocaine related offenses. Because the Court’s previous orders do not require clarification and because Defendant is not entitled to a reduction of his sentence based on the crack cocaine amendments in light of the Sixth Circuit’s holding that they do not apply retroactively to final sentences, *see United States v. Blewett*, – F.3d – , 2013 WL

6231727, at \*\*1, 3 (6th Cir. Dec. 3, 2013), the Court denies Defendant's motion.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED**, that Defendant's Motion for Clarification of Court's Previously Issued Orders [ECF No. 1246] is **DENIED**.

Dated: February 19, 2014

s/PATRICK J. DUGGAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies to:

Karl Wingo, #15451-039  
FCI Elkton  
P.O. Box 10  
Lisbon, OH 44432

AUSA Wayne Pratt

---

<sup>1</sup>Wingo has filed numerous motions challenging his sentence prior to the pending motion, which this Court has denied. Wingo has appealed most, if not all, of those decisions and the Sixth Circuit has affirmed this Court. The numerous opinions and orders issued by this Court and the Sixth Circuit should provide the clarity Wingo claims he is lacking.